

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

April 24, 2003      LB 540, 759

whether you happen to agree with exactly where he's come down, he has provided a real service, because this is something that I am again convinced that we need to address. It's certainly painful, no doubt about that. But he has sort of forced us to take a look at it at this stage, and I think, accordingly, has performed a real service for the state. This particular approach, or this particular proposal, the property tax levy lid and the homestead and ag land, represents sort of the...what I would say...the visionary approach that is probably typical of Senator Brashear. LB 540 represents a sort of a plain, stick-in-the-mud approach, which is probably typical of me. I'm going to argue for that approach, the LB 540 approach, rather than what Senator Brashear has offered. And really, I don't have a lot more to add to what Senator Beutler and Senator Landis have said. I think they explained it very well. I would just point out that going to \$1.04 across the board will net roughly the same amount of money as going to \$1.10 and implementing the homestead exemption and ag land credits. There is a little bit additional money that would be gained at the state level, if you will, via Senator Brashear's approach here, but not very much. The other important point that I would again emphasize, the LB 540 approach would be very much a tentative let's do what we need to do, only in the amount we need to do it, and only for the amount of time we need to do it. So we're talking about \$1.04 for two years only. The approach suggested here by Senator Brashear is, in effect, a permanent change. So I think that's an important point. A couple other things I'll mention just quickly. Concerning schools and looking forward to LB 540, shifting funding of schools from state money to property tax receipts creates cash flow problems for schools, as you can understand. State aid payments come in ten equal payments beginning in, I think, the first month of September. Property tax receipts, on the other hand, come in April and the following September. So the bigger the shift from state aid to property tax, the more of a cash flow problem that creates. I think the problem is manageable with the \$1.04. I'm not sure that it's manageable without some other changes, if we were to go to \$1.10. I think there are a number of other issues that are raised by this kind of approach which deserve investigation. The...treating owner-operators in an ag situation differently than landowners may be justified, may not be. There would be, I